

1  
2  
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 MICHELE BROWN,  
6 Plaintiff,

7 v.

8 ZELTIQ AESTHETICS, INC., et al.,  
9 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-00972-RFB-NJK

**Order**

[Docket No. 24]

10 Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan. Docket No. 24. The  
11 parties ask the Court to grant a 399-day discovery period. *Id.* at 2.

12 The parties submit that special scheduling should be permitted because there are pending  
13 motions to remand this case to state court and to dismiss, which could limit the scope of this case  
14 and address whether this Court has jurisdiction. *Id.* at 4. The parties essentially seek to stay their  
15 discovery obligations pending the resolution of those two motions without addressing, under the  
16 proper authorities, how a stay of discovery is warranted. *See Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*,  
17 294 F.R.D. 597, 581 (D. Nev. 2013).<sup>1</sup>

18 Accordingly, the discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. Docket No. 24. An  
19 amended discovery plan must be filed by August 12, 2022.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: August 5, 2022

22  
23   
24 Nancy J. Koppe  
25 United States Magistrate Judge  
26  
27

28 <sup>1</sup> Due to the nature of the parties' request for a stay of discovery, the Court need not address the parties' second reason for special scheduling.